R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 068 RC 002 060

APPROACHES TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND TREATMENT IN RURAL SETTINGS. RURAL AND SMALL-TOWN DELINQUENCY--NEW UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACHES.

BY- SCHAFER, WALTER E.

PUB DATE 23 OCT 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.72 16P.

DESCRIPTORS- ACTIVITIES, ACADEMIC FAILURE, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, ATTITUDES, BACKGROUND, BEHAVIOR PROBLEMS, CONDUCT, *COMMUNITY, *DELINQUENCY, *FAMILY (SOCIOLOGICAL UNIT), NEGATIVE ATTITUDES, PERSONALITY, PSYCHOLOGY, *RURAL AREAS, STUDENTS, *SCHOOLS, SELF CONCEPT, SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS, SOCIAL SERVICES, YOUTH AGENCIES,

ALTHOUGH THERE IS A LOWER DELINQUENCY RATE IN RURAL AREAS, THE PROBLEM OF DELINQUENCY IS OF MAJOR CONCERN. THE NATURE OF DELINQUENT ACTS IS USUALLY IN THE FORM OF MINOR BURGLARY, TRESPASSING, AND GENERAL MISCONDUCT, WHILE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DELINQUENTS INCLUDE LACK OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, NEGATIVE ATTITUDES TOWARD SELF AND COMMUNITY, CHOICE OF FRIENDS WITH SIMILAR ATTITUDES, AND WITHDRAWAL FROM CONVENTIONAL ACTIVITIES. FAMILIES CONTRIBUTE TO DELINQUENCY BY CREATING DISTURBED PERSONALITIES, FAILING TO TEACH AND ENFORCE PROPER CONDUCT, AND BY FAILING TO PROVIDE THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BACKGROUND FOR ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT. THE SCHOOL AIDS DELINQUENCY BY CONTRIBUTING TO ACADEMIC FAILURE, GENERATING DISCONTENT OR APATHY AMONG STUDENTS, CREATING AN UNREALISTIC CURRICULUM FOR NON COLLEGE BOUND YOUTH, AND ALIENATING FAILING STUDENTS. THE COMMUNITY ALSO AIDS DELINQUENCY THROUGH LACK OF INTEREST IN SOCIAL ORGANIZATIONS, LACK OF ADEQUATE SOCIAL SERVICES, ABSENCE OF COORDINATION AMONG YOUTH-SERVING AGENCIES, LACK OF CORRECT GOAL DISCRIMINATION IN EFFORTS TO EFFECT CHANGES, AND SEGREGATION OF THE YOUNG VIOLATOR FROM THE COMMUNITY. THIS SPEECH WAS PRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE ON RURAL YOUTH, OCTOBER 23-26, 1967, WASHINGTON, D. C., SPONSORED JOINTLY BY THE U. S. DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, INTERIOR, AND LABOR, OEO, AND THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON YOUTH OPPORTUNITY. (JS)

ED015068

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Special Session on Quality of Living
for Rural Youth

Speech presented at
NATIONAL OUTLOOK CONFERENCE
ON RURAL YOUTH
October 23-26, 1967
Washington, D. C.

APPROACHES TO JUVENILE DELINGUENCY PREVENTION AND TREATMENT IN RURAL SETTINGS
Rural and Small-Town Delinquency: New Understanding and Approaches

Dr. Walter E. Schafer
Department of Sociology
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

RECEIVED
DEC 18 1967
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

Introduction

This address has five objectives, each of which will be treated separately in the following order:

1. To identify the amount and nature of delinquency in non-metropolitan areas.

2. To identify the characteristics of delinquent youth in such areas.

3. To identify the social conditions and influences producing non-metropolitan delinquency.

4. To identify the directions that new approaches to delinquency prevention must take.

5. To explore problems in the development and implementation of new approaches.

Most of the limited time I have been given will be devoted to an analysis of the individual and social sources of delinquency. If this analysis is valid, then the implications for delinquency prevention will fall into place. Unfortunately, time will not permit a detailed discussion of specific forms that new approaches must take or many examples, but it is hoped that these remarks will focus attention on current deficiencies and on new directions in delinquency prevention.

My remarks will refer to the non-metropolitan "hinterland," which includes farm areas; small agricultural, lumbering, and mining towns; and more diversified outlying towns and small cities. Since youth in these settings tend to be involved in similar economic, social, and educational situations, it is useful to treat the three types of areas together. By delinquency I mean law-breaking behavior by youth under 16, 17, or 18, depending on the State.

RC002 060

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

Extent and Nature of Delinquency

How much delinquency is there in non-metropolitan areas? Available evidence from several sources--the Uniform Crime Reports of the F.B.I.; the Juvenile Court Statistics of the Children's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and numerous social science studies--indicate there is substantially less delinquency outside than inside big cities. The Children's Bureau reports, for example, that the following numbers per 1,000 youth population were handled by juvenile courts in 1966 for non-traffic offenses: by courts serving predominantly urban areas, 36 per 1,000 youth; by courts serving mixed urban-rural areas, 27 per 1,000 youth; and by courts serving predominantly rural areas, 13 per 1,000 youth. (These pre-publication figures were kindly provided by Richard Pearlman of the Children's Bureau.) Of course, many more youth than this commit crimes but are never discovered or never reach the juvenile court.

Yet, the lower delinquency rates in the hinterland should not blind us to the fact that delinquency is a problem of major concern. The number of delinquents is still sizable. For example, the Children's Bureau reports that in 1966 the juvenile courts processed 206,000 youth for non-traffic offenses in semi-urban areas and another 48,000 in rural areas. Recent evidence from over a dozen small towns and rural high schools in Oregon indicates that as many as one in five boys is delinquent before he reaches adulthood.1/ Moreover, rural delinquency rates remained fairly stable between 1960 and 1965, but increased more rapidly between 1965 and 1966 than in urban areas. Even though the rates are lower, then, there is still a serious delinquency problem that calls for new approaches at prevention.

Before we can conclude anything about prevention needs and approaches, it is necessary to understand the nature and individual and social sources of delinquency in non-metropolitan areas.

What is the nature of delinquency in the hinterland? There is considerable evidence that rural small town delinquency is less serious than big city delinquency. Several studies, for example, show that rural offenders are more likely to engage in minor burglary, trespassing, and general misconduct, and are less likely to commit more serious offenses such as auto theft, serious burglary or robbery.2/ Not only do rural delinquents engage in less serious crimes, but they tend to be less sophisticated in the methods used.3/ This is probably due to the absence of a "professional criminal culture," which has a substantial influence on big city delinquents. While such a professional criminal culture is likely to be absent, there is considerable evidence of a "trouble-making" subculture among hinterland youth.4/ This subculture frequently exists alongside the dominant teenage subculture emphasizing

sports, dates, extracurricular activities, and cars; and alongside the smaller subculture emphasizing intellectual growth and academic achievement. For example, my colleague, Kenneth Polk, recently reported the following from a study of youth in a small town in Oregon.

> Familiarity with and some degree of involvement in a deviant adolescent subculture seems evident for all of the populations of troublesome adolescents considered. While there are no "gangs" as the term is used to apply to the group behavior of metropolitan slum delinquents, data are found here which show a commonly held value and common patterns of behavior among delinquents and problem youth which are different from those of non-delinquents. These data support the notion that there is an important subcultural context for delinquency and other youth problems in the hinterland.5/

An important practical implication of these findings is that preventive efforts should be aimed at deviant groups and not just at individual delinquents.

Characteristics of Delinquents

What are the major individual differences between delinquents and non-delinquents? What experiences seem to precede and help cause delinquent behavior? Unfortunately, there is not a great deal of evidence on these questions for non-metropolitan youth. However, I believe I can shed some understanding by summarizing some new data comparing two-time delinquent boys with non-delinquents from all high schools in a predominantly rural small town county in Oregon. The data, which were gathered at two points of time, the sophomore and junior years of high school, are summarized here for the first time.6/

The findings are consistent with earlier evidence in showing that delinquents differ from non-delinquents most sharply in their lack of success in school. Other differences seem to be tied to and to largely result from this factor. For example, there were no differences in social class background, but over three times more delinquents than non-delinquents graduated from high school with below a C average. Other evidence suggests this is the tail end of an accumulation of failure and frustration. Delinquents were also less involved in school activities, and reported much more negative attitudes toward school. It is not surprising that delinquents were behavior problems in school, nor that almost half dropped out before graduation, despite the fact that almost every single one wished in retrospect that he had stayed in school.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

Part of the process of alienation is the early and progressively greater development of negative attitudes toward the surrounding community. This is reflected, for example, in the fact that delinquents more often agreed with statements like, "most people in this community would treat you like dirt if they could." It is also important to note that delinquents reported lower educational and occupational aspirations and expectations. It is very likely, however, that these differences would not have appeared earlier in the school career, but that self-evaluations and personal aspirations have been gradually scaled down. In view of these academic and behavior problems, delinquents are probably accurate in their reported pessimism about getting and keeping a good job in the future. There is growing evidence from here and elsewhere that the pessimism is deepened by the fact that delinquents are most often not college-bound--and, therefore, see themselves as going nowhere.

The data also clearly show that delinquents were associated with close friends who likewise had academic difficulties, were uninvolved in school activities, had negative attitudes toward school, and were delinquent themselves. We don't really know, of course, which came first, but it is reasonable to assume that youth with common attitudes and problems gradually find each other out and come together. In this study, the apparent result was strong loyalty to each other, mutual disdain for school and the law, and collective support for displays of touchness, boldness and rebelliousness--which sometimes ran afoul of the law.

What I have been describing here suggests a pattern of failure in school (despite an almost universal desire to make it), and progressive withdrawal by delinquents of involvement in and loyalty to conventional and acceptable activities and behavior-standards. They also suggest the gradual development of a new identity--as an outsider, a trouble-maker, a dead-ender; and the gradual immersion into peer groups made up of boys with similar problems who collectively adopt deviant interests and standards of behavior. At the same time, there appears to be increasing pessimism toward ever really succeeding in school or in a job.

Social Sources of Delinquency

Students of delinquency increasingly recognize that delinquency is not just the result of individual motivation but is produced by social conditions and influences. Prevention efforts, therefore, must be aimed, not just at the individual trouble-maker or potential trouble-maker, but at the surrounding social context. If this position has merit, we must ask, what <u>are</u> the social conditions and influences that cause academic failure, alienation from school, pessimism toward the future, and delinquency? There are, of course, many interrelated environmental factors but among the most important are the home, the school, and the community.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

First, the family. There are basically three ways the family can contribute to delinquency: by creating disturbed personalities, by failing to teach and enforce proper conduct, and by failing to provide the necessary intellectual skills, habits, and stimulation for the youngsters' success in school and the community. Evidence from our study shows that, although delinquents somewhat more often came from broken homes, their home environments certainly did not appear to be pathological. This is consistent with previous research. We do not know much about the extent to which delinquents' parents facilitated or hindered school achievement in their child-rearing practices, although part of the reason for poor school performance and adjustment probably lies in home influences. We do not know that parents of delinquents were just as concerned about their youngsters getting good grades and graduating from school as were the parents of non-delinquents. This finding, too, is consistent with previous research.

One of the trends accompanying industrialization and urbanization is the weakening of controls by parents, as the father shifts to non-agricultural work, more and more mothers work, and as youth spend more and more time with peers. Such a trend, of course, occurs more among some families than others. Some evidence of weaker family controls among delinquents than non-delinquents does appear in our study. By itself, however, this certainly does not appear to totally account for delinquent conduct. While delinquency prevention efforts aimed at the family are needed, then, they probably will not result in any great reductions in delinquency by themselves. Moreover, the family is not a public institution and therefore is not directly accessible to change. We simply delude ourselves if we think we can reduce delinquency by focusing exclusively on the family. We must look elsewhere, which brings us to an examination of the schools' contribution to delinquency.7/

A position increasingly taken by students of delinquency is that the school is not only the place where pressures toward delinquency usually develop and build within the adolescent, but that the school itself is a very important cause of failure, frustration, discontent, and, ultimately, delinquency. And even when the school is not a direct cause, it is increasingly seen as failing to offset delinquent tendencies set in motion by influences outside the school. In a sense, then the school contributes to delinquency through both sins of commission and sins of omission.

It is not known how much the school contributes to delinquency in these two ways. But it is known that because the school is a public institution, and, in contrast to the family, is open to direct change, it can be a powerful deterrant to delinquency.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

How does the school contribute to delinquency? It does so in at least four ways. First, the school contributes to academic failure, which in turn helps cause delinquency. This is a bold statement, but available evidence strongly suggests it is a true one. It does not say the family, peer influences, and other forces are unimportant, it simply says the school itself is one cause of academic failure, although it is probably a more important cause than usually thought..

Children and youth grow up in a world that tells them every day in countless ways that achievement in school and in later life is important. They get this message from parents, teachers, the news media. And available evidence shows that most youth themselves want to do at least better than their fathers and to succeed in school in order to achieve that goal. Yet some youngsters do fail, nevertheless. Partly this results from adverse home influences--inadequate use of language, the absence of books and pencils, too little affection and too much or too inconsistent or too little discipline by parents. Yet, if we assume that the school's job is to educate, to stretch each youngster's ability as far as possible, then it is part of the schools' job to make up deficiencies, to instill motivation, and to fill in the necessary gaps. Despite the successes of Head Start and other compensatory programs (which tend to be significant but temporary as long as subsequent elementary experiences are unchanged), most schools are still failing to do much to offset psychological, intellectual, or attitudinal handicaps. The resulting failure (and delinquency) can only be seen, then, as a failure of the school itself. Such failure is not inevitable, I suggest.

There is increasing evidence that teachers frequently underestimate the potential of many underachieving students, especially if they are Negro or lower class. Such underestimating can and does have a devastating effect on pupil performance (and subsequent behavior) in two ways. First, an important ingredient in pupil performance is a positive self-evaluation of ability. Self-evaluation of ability in turn is largely caused by other's evaluations. If teachers--on the basis of the performance or behavior of older brothers or sisters, premature conclusions, or inaccurate test scores--underestimate the potential of the student, he is likely not to think very well of himself and to perform lower than he otherwise would. Second, if a teacher thinks a pupil is slow, dumb, or unintelligent, she is likely to treat the student as though that were true, setting in motion a self-fulfilling prophecy that ends with the student in fact behind his classmates. The common practice of ability grouping formalizes this process. If a test score says a pupil is not very bright, he is placed in a slow group, and expectations and level of teaching are scaled down accordingly. Sure enough the pupil labelled as not very bright ends up not very bright--and thereby is a candidate for failure and rebellion.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

Evidence for the importance of teacher expectations comes from a recent study in which teachers of some youngsters were told to expect improvements in classroom performance on the basis of mythical test scores. Teachers of others--of the same measured ability--were told to expect no change. Sure enough, those whose teachers were told to expect improvement did improve.

Rigid "tracking" practices in high school also contribute to erosion of motivation, failure, and eventual delinquency. Whatever the positive benefits--like insulation of middle-class, college-bound students from non-college-bound, low-achieving students--there appear to be several important negative effects on pupils who end up on a lower track. The curriculum choice is almost irreversible. The lower track is usually stigmatized by teachers and students, and non-college-bound students feel this acutely. There is frequently a grade ceiling--teachers of non-college-bound courses are not expected to give anything higher than a C. The effect on motivation should be obvious. As we'll see in more detail in a few minutes, these adverse consequences of tracking are further compounded by the frequent belief (usually an accurate one) by non-college-bound pupils that they are on a dead-end road.

These are some of the ways, then, that the school contributes to failure and, therefore, to delinquency. Although the school is expected to evaluate, differentiate, sort, and select, it is not expected to, nor must it, fail anyone.

A second way the school helps cause delinquency is by generating discontent or apathy among large numbers of students, including most eventual delinquents. It does this partly by causing failure, but it does it in other ways too, even to youngsters who are not failing. I think I can describe what I mean here under two headings: the structure of authority and the structure of learning. I will refer to the structure of authority first.

A well-known principle in theories of organizations that are in the business of trying to change people is that if those who are being changed--be they inmates, prisoners, patients or students--are involved in as many decisions as possible about the way the organization is run and about their own activities in the organization, they will be much more interested in and committed to the organization's goals than if they are unquestioningly subordinated to those in authority. Is this principle applied in the schools? I suggest not. Rather, pupils have very little to say about how the school is run or about their own fates. The assumption is they are young, uninformed, irresponsible, and potentially disruptive. The result is a great deal of social distance, and the natural, built-in potential for conflict, resistance, and hostility. Several social scientists have drawn an analogy--which is a valid one--between Negroes, the poor, and students. All are clearly locked out,

subordinate, and at the virtual mercy of those above them. The white wife of a white graduate student at my university who understood this recently remarked to her husband in the presence of another faculty member, "Honey, when can we begin to live like white folks?" In the high school, there are student councils, but they are usually nothing but tools of the administration. The predictable outcome is lack of communication, apathy, and often hostility, not to mention the loss to the school of a great deal of creativity, insight, and innovative energy. Clearly, school officials must have ultimate authority, but need their sense of status and security be so precarious that they cannot share some of that authority with students? It now appears to be that precarious. And the generational gap, together with apathy, disinterest, hostility, and delinquency, increase.

Let me turn to the structure of learning. If one were to dream up a model for learning that embodied the very opposite of known principles of learning, he would have to go no further than the nearest school to see it better illustrated. What are some of these principles? People learn at different rates. People are interested in different things at different times. People become more interested in learning if they have some choice of subject matter, timing, and pace. People learn more and become more interested in learning if they can actively and sometimes independently search, question, find tentative answers, and if they can experience the actual consequences of learning decisions. Finally, they become more excited and develop more rapidly if the subject matter relates to their present and perceived future experiences.

If these principles are applied in practice, there come to be intrinsic rewards from learning and growing, rather than empty, extrinsic rewards such as grades or gold stars that someone in authority passes out. It is no wonder that the lock-step, paced, unengaging, detached school career we have created leads so many youngsters--who are at least neutral and usually openly excited when they begin school--to lose interest, become apathetic if not rebellious toward school, and to turn elsewhere for their kicks. Sometimes, if family, neighborhood or peer influences are right, the result is delinquent behavior.

A third way the school contributes to delinquency is by providing a dead-ended education for many non-college-bound youth. Rural and small town high schools are especially guilty of this sin of commission. I need hardly remind you that three important labor market changes confront today's non-metropolitan youth. First, agricultural-related jobs are rapidly disappearing. Therefore, large numbers of youth must expect to move to the city. Second, the jobs that are opening in the cities are primarily white collar and available blue collar jobs are not numerous enough to absorb the influx of non-college-educated rural youth. Therefore, if urban-bound youth are to have a future, they must graduate from high school and either get some college or other post-high school

training or have a sound educational base to be easily trainable. Third, automation and cibernation are resulting in the wholesale disappearance of old jobs and creation of new ones. Youth entering the world of work, then, must expect to change jobs several times, especially if they begin at the blue collar level, or must have a sound enough educational base to be adaptable.

Despite these changes, the fact remains that most non-college-bound students are drastically underprepared for the job market. Vocational education usually provides overspecific, unusuable, quickly outdated skills, and other courses usually provide little more than a smattering of this and a taste of that. Perhaps we could call it general mis-education for working class living. Moreover, the school does not really see it as its job to keep up on labor market needs, nor to be sure that its graduates have been adequately counseled and guided into satisfying jobs with a future. But neither does anyone else. The result is that non-college-bound youth, especially boys, are grossly underprepared for the world of work, which they enter rather blindly. This is especially true, of course, in impoverished agricultural and mining areas.

Evidence is growing that many youth know these things and that the perceived lack of payoff of present school tasks and demands is an important reason why many youth lose interest, and turn to deviant forms of behavior for excitement.

A fourth way the schools contribute to delinquency is by reacting to students who fail or get into trouble in ways that further alienate them, rather than drawing them back.8/ Especially if a boy or girl is already not very interested or is hostile, the schools' all-too typical reactions of public labelling, suspension, assignment to a special classroom for trouble-makers, closing off of opportunities for involvement in extra-curricular activities or withdrawing other privileges, often has the predictable outcome of making him reject and turn away even more. Deviant behavior becomes even more appealing. Instead of pulling back the deviant by dealing with student-teacher relationships that lead to his difficulties and by making sure he gets involved in legitimate activities, the school often labels, pushes away, excludes and humiliates those who misbehave. If it does make what it regards as a "positive" response, it is likely to be an attempt to change the student's psyche or personality rather than to improve the student's skills or to change the reaction patterns of teachers.

Such reactions to "trouble," then, have the frequent outcome of increasing, not decreasing, the chances of delinquency. Moreover, the so-called "drop-out problem" should be renamed the "force-out problem" in many cases.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

Why do the schools continue to produce or aggravate delinquency in the four ways I have described? I think the reasons are partly internal and partly external to the school. Inside, the schools are perhaps the most rigid, traditionalistic organizations around--with the possible exception of the universities. Personnel in education are primarily concerned with doing things they now do a little bit better, rather than with changing current structures and conceptions. The schools of education perpetuate the problem by persisting to turn out status-quo-oriented graduates. Further, the schools, unlike most organizations in the private sector, give very little if any of their energies to "monitoring" their programs or to evaluating their outcomes. As a result, they never really confront themselves with the need to change. Another internal problem is that rural and small town schools are frequently too small to provide a rich, diversified curriculum and other needed counseling and corrective services.

Part of their problem, however, is external. They simply do not have adequate resources to hire and keep good personnel, and to develop the needed curriculum, counseling, and compensatory services.

I have been focusing on social conditions and influences that produce delinquency, first in the family, and then in the educational system. I have spent a good deal of time on the school because I regard it as a major--yet largely ignored--source of delinquency and because I believe preventive efforts must be principally centered on the school. But I would now like to offer a few brief observations about some of the sins of commission and the sins of omission in the rest of the community.

First, there is very little opportunity for engaging, constructive involvement by youth in organizations and activities that might continue to hold their interest. With increasing age segregation, generational distance and peer conformity, there is very little opportunity for youth, especially alienated ones and those in remote rural or small town communities, to have a significant sense of participation. This used to come naturally: the son was involved with his family and neighbors in the fields, but this opportunity for contact is rapidly disappearing. When students have difficulty in school and begin to turn away and get involved, with others in trouble, then, there are few other legitimate opportunities and involvements to hold them back.

Second, I need hardly remind you that rural areas are usually sadly deficient in social services of all kinds. When problems arise with a family or a youngster, the lack of resources prevents the community from responding with anything but a minimum of services.

Third, even when there are social work, health, and community welfare services, they tend to miss many people, because of distance and inaccessibility. For example, since my home county is some one hundred miles across, there are remote communities that simply do not benefit from preventive, remedial, rehabilitative, or employment services that might benefit youth and deter delinquency.

Fourth, as in the cities, there is a notorious absence of coordination among youth-serving agencies. As a result, there is a great amount of overlap, gaps in service or even conflict in intervention techniques between the school, the juvenile court, the police, family agencies, poverty agencies, churches, and youth organizations. A glaring example is that no agency or organization usually is given (or takes) the responsibility for providing educational, guidance, or "rehabilitative" services to out-of-school, out-of-work youth--who are among the likliest candidates for delinquency.

Fifth, there is often an unnecessary and in fact dangerous tendency in the community, as in the school, to focus change efforts in the psyches or personalities of the deviants, rather than on the community circumstances that made the youngster become alienated or on the relationship between the youth and the institutions and agencies with which he has trouble getting along. This is not to say that there are not some genuinely disturbed delinquents who need psychological help, but the increasing "therapeutic emphasis" in some of the helping professions only serves, in many cases, to deflect attention away from the way the troubled youngster relates to--and is related to--by his community. For these reasons, I find the notion of delinquency "treatment" distasteful.

Sixth, and finally, our usual reaction to deviants of all kinds is to push them farther and farther away, to exclude them, and, finally, to segregate them from the community. Certainly, this is the dominant type of reaction to the repeated young violator by the juvenile court, the police, and other youth-serving agencies. As in the school, every effort must be made to re-involve and re-integrate the trouble-maker, rather than to progressively stigmatize, exclude, and cut off future opportunities for legitimate and engaging involvements.

New Approaches in Delinquency Prevention

So much, then, for an all-too-brief analysis of what I believe to be the major social conditions and forces contributing directly or indirectly to delinquency in non-metropolitan areas. I have spent most of my time focusing on the roots of delinquency, rather than on prescribing panaceas. If this analysis is valid, then there are clear implications for change. This brings me to the fourth topic mentioned at the beginning: what are

the directions that new approaches to delinquency prevention must take? I certainly don't have all the answers as to how specifically to meet prevention needs. Conditions, resources, and specific problems vary from place to place, but I think the directions in which we must go are clear.

I firmly believe that delinquency prevention must center on the school. The school is a public institution, is charged with the job of preparing young people for adulthood, and is potentially, if not now, very central in the lives of most young people. If the school career is engaging, rewarding, and if it can promise a future, the chances of delinquency will be vastly decreased. The President's Crime Commission had this to say about the role of education in delinquency prevention:

> The school, unlike the family, is a public institution for training young people. It is, therefore, more directly accessible to change through the development of new resources and policies. And since it is the principal public institution for the development of a basic commitment by young people to the goals and values of our society, it is imperative that it be provided with the resources to compete with illegitimate attractions for young peoples' allegiance. Anything less would be a serious failure to discharge our Nation's responsibility to its youth.9/

Among the educational reforms required are the following:

1. In order to minimize the chances that any students will fail, there must be vast expansion of pre-school, remedial, and compensatory programs. Teachers must be trained and retrained so they can be sensitive to different needs and deficiencies among their pupils, and so they will not underestimate the potential of students. Grouping and tracking procedures must be carefully re-examined and in some cases eliminated.

2. In order to arrest the growing apathy and disinterest that seems to set in the longer students are in school, students must be given a significant sense of genuine participation in decision-making in school, and the entire structure of learning must be re-examined. New curriculum and teaching innovations must be made that will assure greater independence, choice, application, differences in timing and pace, and exploration. I do not mean the three R's should go out the window, but that they should be taught within quite a different framework--so there are inherent, intrinsic attractions to learning. As Vice President Humphrey said at the opening of this conference, why should young people have to chase after education? Why

can't education chase after young people? The use of simulated games and more direct involvement in community and work experiences are specific ways of altering the structure of learning.

3. In order to give all youth a sense of going somewhere, the non-college preparatory curriculum must be drastically reformed, with more out-of-school work experience, the employer doing more of the job-specific training, a much sounder educational base, more contact by school planners with employers and labor market needs, much better occupational guidance and follow-up by the school, and alternative routes into jobs with a future. The New Careers for the Poor model is especially appealing as an alternative to the present pattern of vocational training. This model calls for articulation of the curriculum with out-of-school work and training in sub-professional jobs that are linked up into a new career line into white collar professions, especially in the helping professions.

4. In order to draw back youth who have become alienated, humiliating and expulsionary sanctions must be eliminated and the school must make special, positive efforts to see that such youth are steered into academic and extra-curricular activities that will improve their skills, habits and attitudes, be rewarding, and provide an incentive for continuing to conform and to grow in desired directions. Examples of such responses are having students in trouble engage in cross-age tutoring, giving them responsibility for supervising other students, and hiring them as teachers' aides, research aides, and library aides.

5. In order to help create a more supportive family environment, the school must develop means for both reaching out to assist families and drawing the family closer to the school.

If these educational reforms are to occur, two other changes must also come about. Within the school system, there must be a loosening up, a greater emphasis on innovation and experimentation, and much closer and extensive evaluation of outcomes. At the same time, you and I must make sure that the schools get the necessary dollars and supportive, progressive community leadership to make such changes possible.

In addition to these educational reforms, there must be economic and other changes that will assure an adequate standard of living and stability for all families, especially in poor areas, so they in turn can provide the moral strength, controls, and healthy environment that will produce successful, concerned and committed adolescents.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

In the community, there must be much more opportunity for active, productive involvement of young people. The President's Crime Commission had this to say on the subject:

> Although young people, especially young rebels, may resist lectures, appeals, even handouts, they respond to opportunities for responsible involvement. Their participation in community activities should be actively sought. They can help operate community centers, plan neighborhood organizations and improvement efforts; develop programs that will attract other youth; among other benefits, their participation will improve communication between the generations. They can run youth centers of their own. Encouraging them to participate in civil rights and political activities will engage their immediate energies and at the same time inform and enlist them for long-term commitment.10/

There must also be much more effort made to develop and extend social, employment, and other services to remote areas, so that present voids in services can be filled and so that available services can be made known and be made fully available to all citizens. Just because a person lives in a remote area, his chances for receiving needed services should not be any less than if he lived in a city.

Better coordination of services is also a must. Along with an increasing number of others, I take the position that the school should be the center and coordinator of most youth services. This way there will be better coordination, coherence and coverage. An important specific need is for the school to take over responsibility for dropouts. With agencies coordinated by the school, needed retraining and guidance services would be close at hand.

Finally, every effort must be made to help the youngster in trouble in the community and to develop necessary resources and programs to re-involve and reintegrate him into legitimate organizations and activities and to equip him with the necessary skills and habits for getting along.

A Word on Development and Implementation

I will close with a few brief comments about the development and implementation of delinquency prevention measures. Since time does not permit a discussion of specific examples of programs, I will end with several general comments. As Professor John Galbraith has said, we are plagued in this country by private affluence combined with public poverty. This is a time of rapid change, as we all know, and technological progress has outstripped our ability to keep up socially, psychologically, and morally. If we believe that delinquency and other social problems are

truly products or symptoms of social change and resulting strains, we must respond with public efforts to deal with them. Certainly, these efforts will be costly, but not as costly as mental hospitals, prisons, correction institutions, and welfare programs.

We must not let our fixation on individual achievement as the solution to all problems blind us into believing that delinquency will simply go away if we tell young people to put their noses to the grindstone or if we punish them enough. While individual youth achieve or do not achieve and conform or deviate, there are external conditions around some of them that impede their chances of leading productive, satisfying lives. When we want to cure or reduce malaria, we do not stop with swatting millions of mosquitos, we proceed to spray the ponds that breed the mosquitos. In the same way, we must make the necessary planned and deliberate social, political, economic, and educational adjustments to keep as many young people as possible within the legitimate pathway to adulthood. We must focus some of our preventive efforts on the individual delinquent or pre-delinquent, but we must do much more than that by modifying the conditions that product them.

We complain about federal encroachment into State and local affairs. But if we fail to exercise proper leadership and to meet our responsibilities at the community level, the federal government will--and should--fill the gap.

The challenge is before us.

Dr. Walter E. Schafer

FOOTNOTES

1/. Kenneth Polk and John Koval, "Problem Youth in a Small City," in Malcolm W. Klein (editor), Juvenile Gangs in Context: Theory, Research and Action, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967, pp. 123-138.

2/. See, for example, John P. Clark and Eugene P. Wenninger, "Socio-Economic Class and Area As Correlates of Illegal Behavior among Juveniles," American Sociological Review, 27, (December 1962).

3/. Polk, ibid., p. 223.

4/. Polk, ibid., p. 223; Lamar T. Enyey and Jerome Rabow, "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation," American Sociological Review, 26 (October 1961), pp. 674-695.

5/. Polk and Koval, op. cit., p. 129.

6/. The sample sizes are as follows: delinquents 73, non-delinquents 237. Since a higher proportion of delinquents than non-delinquents were interviewed at both points in time, these figures do not accurately portray delinquency rate in the various communities.

7/. For a more extensive analysis of the educational sources of delinquency, see Walter E. Schafer and Kenneth Polk, "Delinquency and the Schools," in Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, Washington, D.C.; the Presidents' Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967, pp. 222-277. This report also includes a detailed statement of recommendations for educational change for delinquency prevention.

8/. For a more extended analysis of school reactions to deviants, see Walter E. Schafer, "Deviance in the Public Schools: An Interactional View," in Edwin J. Thomas (editor) Behavioral Science for Social Workers, New York: Free Press, 1967.

9/. The Presidents' Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 69; also reprinted in Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, ibid., p. 48.

10/. The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, ibid., p. 68, and Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, ibid., p. 48.